THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII. AUGUST, 1928. No. 8.

The Means of Grace.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part IV.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

(Concluded.)

But can it be said also of children that Baptism justifies them? They are certainly, it is argued, not yet able to partake of the merits of Christ. That was the reason why the disciples turned them away. Matt. 19, 13; Luke 18, 15. But what did Jesus say? "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 19, 14; Luke 18, 15; Mark 10, 14. These "little children" cannot possibly have been fully grown up, for they were carried in the arms. Matt. 19, 13; Mark 10, 13; Luke 18, 15. And the disciples did not chide the children, but those that bore them. Furthermore, the term which Luke employs to designate the children (*βρέφη*) is used in his writings only of the new-born or of the fruit in the womb. Luke 18, 15. [*Note.* — *Βρέφη:* of the new-born, Luke 2, 12; Acts 7, 19; of the fruit in the womb, Luke 1, 41. 44.] But the meaning of the "kingdom of heaven" which belongs to the children is shown Rom. 14, 17: "The kingdom of God is not meat or drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." So, then, these three things belong to them: the righteousness of Christ, the peace of God, and the joy in the Holy Ghost. But does not Christ say, "*Of such* is the kingdom of heaven"? Matt. 19, 14. Happy are we that He did say so; otherwise no adult would get into heaven. But did He, with the words "of such," wish to exclude the little children? Surely not; He rather made them the leaders of the procession to Salem. He says: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me"; they will be saved before all others; indeed, only such as they. [*Note.* — The *Hirschberg Bible* gives a very good explanation of the word "such" in Matt. 19, 18: "The children and those who, by committing themselves without malicious resistance to My arms of grace, become like them." . . . Christ

makes every misinterpretation of His words impossible by adding: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Mark 10, 15.] Heaven, however, does not belong to them for the same reason that it belongs to the angels, who are without sin, but in like manner as it belongs to sinful men; for they were conceived in sins. Ps. 51, 7; Job 25, 4; Ps. 58, 4; Gen. 8, 21. But sinners are saved in no other way than by water and the Spirit. John 3, 3. 5. Therefore children may not only, nay, they must be, baptized; "for," says the Lord, "it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." Matt. 18, 14. In obedience to this will the Christian Church has always baptized her little ones, so much so that St. John writes not only to the fathers and to the young men, but also to the children that their sins are forgiven for the sake of Jesus' name, 1 John 2, 12. 13; so much so that St. Irenaeus teaches that regeneration [in Baptism] is given to the sucklings, and little children, and youths, and young men, and old men; yes, so much so that already Origen meditated on the question which sins are forgiven little children in Holy Baptism. [*Note.* — The originator of the evil custom of postponing Baptism to the adult years was Tertullian: *"Fiant Christiani, dum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat* INNOCENS *aetas ad remissionem peccatorum?"* (*De Baptismo,* II, 18.) He endeavored to abolish infant baptism because he did not understand the Scriptural doctrine of original sin. But if he tried to abolish it, it certainly must have been in common use at that time. Origen simply says: *"Ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare."*] And, God be praised, the Church of Jesus Christ to this day baptizes her children. For to this day it is the will of our heavenly Father that none of these little ones should perish. And to this day no other way has been discovered to bring them into heaven than by water and the Spirit.

But does this not deny justification by faith? Do we with this doctrine not enter upon papistical ground? For if the sucklings are justified in their baptism, then it is certain that the Sacraments *can* at least be effective without faith, by simple application. True. But who says that the little children do not believe? Our observation alone can hardly decide in this matter. For we also observe no reason in them, and yet we do not conclude that they are brutes. What, then, does God's Word say? Already the fact that the Lord awards salvation to them is well worthy of our notice; for one might reason this way: "He who does not believe will not be saved;

therefore they believe." But we do not reason that way. For else we might be censured for building incomprehensible doctrines upon artificial conclusions. If, however, God should anywhere in the Scriptures clearly declare that the children believe, then we would ask permission to abide by that statement of our God in singleness of heart. Now, Matt. 18, 6 teaches this very thing. In the first part of that chapter we learn that the disciples quarreled about which of them should occupy the first place in the kingdom of heaven. Then Jesus took a child and set him in the midst of them and said: "Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 18, 4. Then He proceeded to depict the glory of the children before their eyes: Whoso shall receive one such little child (*ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο*) in My name receiveth Me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me (*ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ*), it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Matt. 18, 6. The connection shows clearly that children are being spoken of in this passage, so that the evasion that "little ones" in this place means as much as "large ones" is out of place here. Just as little does the subterfuge that *"to believe"* means "the mere possibility of believing," therefore really, "not to believe," satisfy our conscience. And even with such an interpretation the opponents of infant faith would have gained but little. For the Lord would still teach that infant faith, which they declare to be impossible, is possible. But one might say that the child in question was not a very little child. Maybe, although Christ calls it "little." But what will we do with Ps. 71, 6? There the psalmist prays: "By Thee have I been holden up *from the womb.*" (Luther's version: *"Auf dich habe ich mich verlassen* VON MUTTERLEIBE AN.") [*Note.* — Ps. 71, 6: נִסַּמְכְתָּ, Niphal of סָמַךְ, occurs six times in the Bible and always means "to lean upon." Judg. 16, 29; 2 Kings 18, 21; Is. 36, 6; 2 Chron. 32, 8; Is. 42, 2; Ps. 71, 6.] And Ps. 8, 2 the singer explains: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength because of Thine enemies." According to the express testimony of Christ this was fulfilled when the children saluted Him in the Temple with their hosanna. Matt. 21, 15. 16. Finally, David * rejoices, Ps. 22, 9: "Thou [Lord] art He that took me out of the womb; Thou didst make me hope

* It must not be overlooked that the Messiah is speaking here, and hence this text is not pertinent. — ED.

[believe] when I was upon my mother's breasts." [*Note.* — בָּטַח means "to trust." The Hiphil, . . . in all the five passages where it occurs in the Bible, means "to make one trust," "to cause to believe." Is. 36, 15; Jer. 28, 15; 19, 31; 2 Kings 18, 30; 22, 9.]

What shall we say to this? Shall we put new coats on all these texts to make them look different from the way God made them? That would be a tedious and very unpleasant task. I think we will come out honestly and say: "The Bible contains numberless errors, and this is one of them." Or we will bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ and believe that He is able to do what He says. Not as though we took bud and blossom to be the same or imagined that a child perceives and discerns just as we can. But this is what we confess, basing it upon the Word of God: The soul of the child grasps the hand which God offers to it in the Sacrament just as well as we, yea, even better. For does a child not cling to the neck of its mother with both its little arms when it sees an animal coming? And is the maxim, "I see it not, therefore it does not exist," really unassailable? Does it not, when seriously applied, lead to the denial of the existence of God and the soul? Is it not, after all, better to abide by the Word of God? Verily, I am afraid to judge it, for it will judge me. John 12, 48. Therefore we simply teach with Luther that the little children who are baptized believe through the power of the Word which is prayed over them. (St. Louis Ed., XIX, 589.) Or, as John Gerhard says: "The Holy Spirit, through Baptism, presents to the children both faith and forgiveness of sins. For the Scriptures link these two things, faith and forgiveness, together with an unbreakable chain" *(Spiritus Sanctus per baptismum et fidem et peccatorum remissionem infantibus donat, quum remissionem peccatorum et fidem adamantino quodam vinculo Scriptura sacra ubique conjungat).*

Against this argumentation, however, the objection has been raised that genuine justifying faith is a moral struggle for liberty; that it is degraded when it is brought into connection with children; that the model way of salvation is a way through the penitential struggle; that, if children are saved at all, this is possible only if they experience something which is similar to it or at least related to it. But God's Word sweeps such thoughts away like spider-webs. Mark 10, 15 we read: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Thus God's Son turns your entire order of salvation upside down. You say: "If a little child does not

receive the kingdom of God as an adult, it will never enter therein." But Christ says: "All ye old, learned, pious people, even ye My dear disciples yourselves, ye will not be saved if ye do not wish to be saved in the same way as the children." Mark also the verb "receives." "To receive" means "to believe." When it is said, Acts 11, 1, that the Gentiles also received the Word of God, then this means that they believed it. When it is said of the Bereans, Acts 17, 11: "They received the Word with all readiness of mind," then this indicates their joyous faith. When, therefore, Christ testifies: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," then this means: "Whoever does not believe as a little child believes, he shall surely not be saved." [*Note.* — For also Mark 10, 15 has *δέχεσθαι*. And Rom. 14, 17 says what the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* is, namely, righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. I confess that I am unable to comprehend how these three gifts, in fact, all invisible things, can be received in any other way than by faith.] This is Christ's order of salvation. It is hard to understand — and yet easy. Hard, because the Old Adam is so very anxious to drag a little package of merit, and were it only the merit of a penitential struggle, across God's boundary-lines. Easy, for the children have one advantage over us adults — they have no will. And it is just this which hinders our salvation. [*Note.* — Or is something else in the way? Matt. 23, 37: "How often would I . . . and ye would not!"] For our will is free in the domain of sin and evil and has a strong tendency towards all that is evil; so free and so strong it is in this direction that we poor creatures, who are always burdened with this evilly inclined will cannot free ourselves from it in any other way than by fighting to the last drop of blood. But since God's order of salvation consists in this, that we commit ourselves entirely to His fatherly hands, therefore He has given us the children as patterns. To us, indeed, the saying applies: "Break thy will; endure afflictions!" But, verily, the fact that we resist God so much is no point in our favor. Happy are we if in *this* respect we become like unto the sucklings by committing ourselves to our faithful God without resisting Him. But woe unto us if we do not consider such return to the estate of children necessary; for Christ says: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." Matt. 18, 3.

This simple doctrine has always resounded in the Evangelical [Lutheran] Church. Martin Chemnitz developed it with special

clearness in his examination of the Decrees of Trent. Gerhard did it still more fully, especially with respect to the faith of children. And thus it has been faithfully handed down to us, so that Spener still confessed: "Concerning the children we believe that in one and the same Baptism all things happen at the same time: the bestowal of faith, the justification, or remission of sins, and the remaining regeneration, or creation of a new nature in us."

But the assertion that the honor bestowed upon the Sacraments encroaches upon the doctrine of "by faith *alone*" is at variance with the Scriptures and with history. With the Scriptures, for *they* designate the Word of God as the means of salvation just as often as they designate faith as such. With history, for all the confessions of our Evangelical [Lutheran] Church, from the Augsburg Confession down, emphasize both with equal force. The [Augsburg] Confession says: "Eternal righteousness, the Holy Ghost, eternal life, — these things cannot come but by the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, as Paul says, Rom. 1, 16: 'The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth'" [*Justitia aeterna, Spiritus Sanctus, vita aeterna. Haec non possunt contingere nisi per ministerium Verbi et sacramentorum, sicut Paulus dicit Rom. 1, 16: „Evangelium est potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti"*]. (*Triglotta,* 85.) And the Apology: "When we say: 'Faith alone makes godly' [*fromm*], we with the word *sola* do not exclude the Word and the Sacraments, as though the Word and the Sacraments were in vain, if faith does it all, as the adversaries charge us, *but it is the opinion of our merit in the matter* that we exclude." [German text.] (*Triglotta,* 140.) (*Excludimus autem opinionem meriti. Non excludimus Verbum et sacramenta, ut calumniantur adversarii. Triglotta,* 141.) And the Large Catechism: "But as our would-be wise and new spirits assert that faith alone saves and that works and external things avail nothing, we answer: It is true, indeed, that nothing in us is of any avail but faith. . . . But these blind guides are unwilling to see this, namely, that faith must have something which it believes, that is, of which it takes hold and upon which it stands and rests. Thus faith clings to the water and believes that it is Baptism, in which there is pure salvation and life; not through the water . . ., but through the fact that it is embodied in [*i. e.,* connected with] the Word and institution of God and the name of God inheres in it. Now, if I believe this, what else is it than believing in God as in Him who has given and planted His Word into this ordinance and proposes to us this external thing wherein

we may apprehend such a treasure? Now, they are so mad as to separate faith, and that to which faith clings and is bound, though it be something external. Yea, it shall and must be something external that it may be apprehended by the senses and understood and thereby be brought into the heart, as indeed the entire Gospel is an external, verbal preaching." (*Triglotta,* 739.) The same doctrine is taught by the Formula of Concord (*Triglotta,* 919. 929. 1087), the Book of Confessions of Duke Julius of Brunswick, and also by the theologians (Luther, St. Louis Ed., XII, 2437—2439; XVI, 1151; XIX, 587. 588. 590. 591).

We do not understand what is meant by the objection that we posit a non-living relationship to Christ. We posit nothing, but cling to the life-line which Christ throws out to us in the Word. He who refuses to take hold of the life-line, but requests the pilot rather to let him grasp his hands, will hardly be saved. If the king grants an audience in his castle, it certainly is better to approach him there with one's petition than to wait and see whether one may chance to meet him in the forest.

Finally, when it is said that it were ill-becoming in God to bind Himself to earthly matter: word, water, bread and wine, this vividly reminds us of Peter: "Lord, dost Thou wash my feet? Thou, the living God? With lowly water?" But what does the Lord reply? "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." John 13, 8. This He also says to the fanatics: "If ye despise My lowly baptismal water and My lowly Word, ye have no part with Me."

The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

Prof. R. W. Heintze, St. Louis, Mo.

IV.

The proper way to become duly saturated with the theological atmosphere of the generation after Luther's death would be to read the publications of that period, not by subject or by author, but by the year, aye, by the month or week, just as they appeared. For the issues which caused controversies within the churches of the Augsburg Confession did not follow one another, but were, in a great measure, contemporaneous. The line-up of the polemical writers, also of the civil authorities, was serrated; for those who stood together in upholding one subject sometimes opposed each other in another. The discussion of a certain issue would produce

a line of arguments sometimes including unguarded statements, and these would open up a side campaign, while the original issue was let alone for a time to be taken up again later with different groupings and not necessarily having settled the problem of the episode. Writers on the history of dogma or on the history of polemics or on symbolics create the impression that the period under discussion was entirely given over to disputes.[1] But both the leaders and the men *minoris generis* were also busy in promulgating the Gospel, in preaching saving faith and sanctification; they were busy in rearing the walls of a positive Bible Church structure. They were doing that in the lecture-room, in the pulpit, in the schools; by word of mouth and by printing pertinent material for the clergy and the laity; by precept of ordinances and by inspections and visitations. Nor must the fact that several of the polemical productions were published in sermon form be taken as evidence that their invectives had been hurled into the congregations assembled for worship. All this should be kept in mind, lest the picture become gloomier than reality warrants; it is gloomy enough. It certainly is not a pleasant picture when, at the synod at Eisleben, 1554, we see the minority spared express rejection of a phrase because the majority "feared it would not be an honest rejection anyhow";[2] nor when the younger Philippists hurled venomous invectives of personal insults while the Gnesio-Lutherans of ducal Saxony had recourse to the tyrannical measure of excommunication and exile; nor when two sets of theologians met at Altenburg,[3] but from October, 1568, to March, 1569, stiffly exchanged notes instead of meeting one another in person. However, this lack of charity, deplorable as it always is, is not really the thing which stamps our period the Critical Period. Indeed, it is not merely the coexistence of the two parties, Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans, which is to be deplored. In fact, there were some distinct aberrations from the position of 1530—46, aberrations which cannot be put into one or the other of these rubrics.

One such aberration was that of Osiander. It is astonishing that the tendency of this Koenigsberg professor was not recognized sooner; for in the fifties he could truthfully say that he had taught

---

1) C. S. Schluesselburg, in his *Catalogus Haereticorum*, 1599, offers a very full enumeration of the books, booklets, and documents produced during that time.

2) *Acta des Synodi zu Eisleben, 13. Feb. des Jars 1554.* Fol. C.

3) *Colloquium zu Altenburgk in Meissen.* Jena, 1569. Fol. 473. Procured through the *Auskunftausschuss* of German libraries.

his doctrine for thirty years. He had studied, mainly philology, at Ingolstadt.[4] In 1522 he took charge of St. Lawrence's Church at Nuremberg and became a champion of the Reformation, stressing particularly its Biblicism. As far as theological learning is concerned, he possibly was an autodidact.[5] The Interim exiled him from Nuremberg, but Duke Albrecht of Prussia made him professor of theology at Koenigsberg; for he had always stressed his agreement with Luther, while in reality he entertained views entirely different from the teachings of Luther, and that with regard to the principal doctrine of the Christian religion — justification. Already at Nuremberg, in 1525, he had shown that the starting-point for him, also in the question of justification, was the Gospel of St. John: the first chapter, the sixth, and the farewell addresses of our Lord.[6] Challenged for some assertions he had made in his Koenigsberg lectures, 1549, he found it necessary to explain in detail his views concerning redemption and justification.[7] From eternity the Word, or Son, *Logos,* he taught, was predestined to become man; and He would have come in the flesh even if sin had not entered the world; for the *image of God* was thus to become reality. During the eternal process, God pours into His image, the divine Word, His entire divine essence, including His holiness. On the other hand, man is originally destined for the indwelling of the divine essence. As Jesus is to be God's image through the personal union of the divine and the human nature, so is man to be His image. Presupposition for this is Christ's redemption on the cross, the historical fact which procured remission of sins. But this remission is not justification; for it happened before we existed, and he who wishes to be justified must believe, which only those can do who exist. To quote him:[8] "Us, who now live and die, Christ has not justified; but we are redeemed thereby from wrath, death, and hell. Therefore Scriptures speak so much of conciliation, redemption. But it is indubitably true that through the fulfilment of the Law and through His suffering

4) W. Moeller, *Andreas Osianders Leben u. ausgew. Schriften.* 1870.

5) Moeller, p. 4, 524.

6) *Ain gut underricht . . . aus hailiger . . . schrifft,* etc., published by three clergymen, but written by Osiander. Moeller, p. 23.

7) *Von dem Einigen Mitler Jhesu Christo u. Rechtf. des Glaubens.* 1551. In it he charges that Melanchthon had misunderstood Luther for the last sixteen years. One month later the book was published in Latin: *De Unico Mediatore.*

8) G. Arnold, *Kirchen- u. Ketzerhistorie,* Part II, Book 16, chapter 24, § 1.

and death He has earned and acquired this great grace, so that the Father has not only forgiven sin and removed the unbearable burden of the Law, but also intends to justify through faith in Christ, *making* us righteous, pouring into us His righteousness, . . . and killing, sweeping away, and entirely destroying the sins which, though forgiven, still dwell in us. So, then, the other part of our dear Mediator's office is to turn *now* to us poor, guilty sinners that we may recognize such great grace and accept it gratefully through faith. Through this faith He resuscitates us from the death of sin and makes us righteous . . . and destroys the sin in our flesh. And that is primarily our justification." The love of God is proclaimed to man in the audible Word, and whenever one trustfully accepts it, the "Inner Word," Logos, and His eternal righteousness enter the heart; not the Word in its purely divine nature, but as it is incarnate in Christ. Thus the indwelling divinity is the Christians' life; but through the medium of its human nature Christians become members of His body, members into which divine holiness is transfused, and the image of God is regained. The act of this kind of justification, of course, is a continuous one, growing in time and accelerated, for instance, by Holy Communion, in which Jesus Christ enters into the Christian in an additional manner. The righteousness which the believer possesses in justification is the essential, eternal, divine righteousness itself. Remission of sins is needed for the sins committed before justification; it is not to be considered a divine imputation upon which man might build his confidence. The thing to do is to depend upon Jesus as He lives and reigns in the heart of the Christian rather than to depend on any imputation, since righteousness in the faithful is not righteousness because it *counts* as such before God, but because it really is God's own righteousness. Luther's use of *"die vor Gott gilt"* he explained as intending merely to guard against the false assumption of a punitive justice in the various passages with *dikaiosyne Theou.* All the Biblical passages in which *justify* undoubtedly means *iustum pronuntiare* are to him figurative; for *iustificare* originally and really *"est ex impio iustum facere sive mortuum ad vitam revocare."*

Osiander's doctrine is a fine specimen of systematic construction, possibly with the exception of his contention that the righteousness of Christ dwelling in the believer is accounted to him also toward forgiveness.[9] From 1549 to his death, 1552, Osiander had

9) O. Ritschl calls it a pleonasm. *Dogmengesch. des Prot.*, II, 1, p. 465.

to defend himself against the almost unanimous attacks of Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans.[10] And when he had passed away, the battle continued. And well it might. For Osiander had touched the spinal nerve of the Lutheran Church. Even though he rejected the Roman Catholic claim that in the infusion of supernatural power human merits cooperate, and though he described the sanctifying indwelling of Jesus in the believer as mere grace, yet his teaching was essentially Roman in that he assumed that great fact which opens the gates of eternal life to be the amelioration of character in man, going on in successive stages and therefore never fit to give sure peace to the penitent sinner. Brenz did not entirely condemn Osiander's statements, but in his *Wuerttemberger Responsum* (December, 1551) he tried to act as mediator. A second Wurttemberg *Opinion* tried to do the same thing; it did not touch the real point at issue. The Duke of Prussia had sent Osiander's *Bekenntnis* to evangelical princes and cities and synods. Objections were raised against his mysticism of the divine indwelling, against the one-sided stressing of Christ's divine nature, against the separation of forgiveness from justification, against his confounding justification and regeneration. And yet, at the funeral service, held after his death, October 19, 1552, a most glorious eulogy was delivered by the Osiandrist Funck. A few months later a Prussian edict declared in favor of the second *Wuerttemberger Gutachten* and commanded silence. Moerlin, one of the most aggressive exponents of Gnesio-Lutheranism, was deported; but Funck continued his activities, uniting the adherents of Osiander into a sort of political court party. There was so much restiveness in Prussia that at last, in the middle of the sixties, the king of Poland, whose vassal the Prussian duke was, had Funck apprehended, tried on a charge of treason, and executed.

The defense of Lutheran concepts of justification, or rather, the attacks upon those of Osiander, brought to light a great many new problems and a great many differences among the attackers themselves. The Italian Franciscus Stancarus, professor at Koenigsberg in 1551, one of the most brusque opponents, had concocted a truly scholastic theory of the Trinity, taking his cue from Peter Lombard, who, to him, was worth more than a hundred Luthers or five hundred Calvins. This peculiar Christology prompted him to insist on the *human* nature of the Savior as effecting reconciliation in the believer's heart, and when he wan-

10) Also Calvin fought against him in *Inst. Rel. Christ.*

dered through Poland, Hungary, Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he proclaimed this particular doctrine of his as the most important fundamental doctrine of Christianity. That he found strong groups of assenters in Poland is indicated by the title of Calvin's books, published nine years after Osiander's death.[11])

During the controversy against Osiander, questions as to the value of the Lord's active obedience arose and occasioned both sound and scholastic argumentation. It is interesting, though sad, to see theologians grasp at anything that tends to make their position acceptable. God's revelation, it is true, shows us many, many facts of which we never would have dreamed, so much do they pass our understanding. But does that permit us to make irrationality a criterion? Osiander's opponents, insisting upon *iustitia imputativa,* argued that irrationality of this *iustitia* was a point in its favor.[12])

When we imagine ourselves transported to that part of the sixteenth century, — and every student of Reformation history must do that, — divesting ourselves of the knowledge of later events, we cannot help but make the following three remarks: That the peculiar theological trend of a renowned, honored man, known for a generation, can escape the verdict of being a basis on which only a false doctrine of justification can be built, is very odd. Was the satisfaction in Central and Northern Germany of having a valiant, courageous ally in the South overshadowing other things? What is the psychology of it? Secondly, although Melanchthon's partisans and those who gathered about Flacius, Menius, Moerlin, etc., had to regard Osiander as their common adversary, and that in a matter essential to the entire cause, this fact did nothing to really unite them. Thirdly, the literature of the period indicates that the central, the pivotal, article of the Reformation, in all its ramifications, was not as clear in the minds of the clergy and the theological professors and was not so well considered by them in all its points at the beginning of this controversy as at the time when the Formula of Concord was agreed upon.

(To be concluded.)

11) *Calvini Responsum ad Fratres Polonos . . . ad Refutand. Stancari Errorem.* Geneva, 1561, and *Epist. Duae ad Ecclesias Polonicas . . . de Negotio Stancariano,* etc., 1561. (Schluesselburg, Book 9, p. 184 sqq.)

12) Menius, *Von der Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt,* 1552, fol. O, 4. Amsdorff, *Auff Osianders Bekenntnis,* 1552, fol. B, 2. Flacius, *Verlegung des Bekenntnis Osiandri,* 1552, fol. A, 4.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Dr. F. A. Schmidt Deceased. — It was a remarkable and varied career that came to its close on May 15, when Dr. Friedrich August Schmidt closed his eyes in death. A review of his life amounts to a survey of the history of a great part of the Lutheran Church in America. No Missourian will read this notice without feelings of melancholy. Born in 1837, Dr. Schmidt received some of his training in the historical log cabin in Perry County, Mo. When Concordia College and Seminary were removed to St. Louis, he joined in the transfer and was graduated in 1857. While in St. Louis, he became interested in the Norwegian language and began that association with Norwegian Lutheranism which was to become the channel in which his life flowed. From 1857 to 1861 he was a member of the Missouri Synod, serving congregations in Eden, N. Y., and in Baltimore. In 1861, Luther College at Decorah, Iowa, had been founded by Norwegian Lutherans, and Rev. Schmidt was called there as one of the professors, serving there till 1872. From 1872 to 1876 he taught at Concordia Seminary; the Norwegian Synod wished to have a man at this school for its students of theology, and Professor Schmidt was called for this purpose. During this period of life he wrote some very strong polemical articles against the doctrinal position of the Iowa Synod. When the Norwegian Synod, in 1876, opened its theological seminary in Madison, he was transferred to that institution and stayed there till 1886. In the mean time the controversy on Conversion and Predestination had broken upon the Church, and Professor Schmidt had become one of the chief opponents of the St. Louis Faculty. In his periodical *Altes und Neues,* founded in January, 1880, he brought the dissension which had been discussed in private for some time before the public, accusing Dr. Walther and his associates of Crypto-Calvinism. To the best of our information he never withdrew this charge. In 1887 he left the Norwegian Synod, the majority of whose members did not share his heterodox views, and with others founded the United Norwegian Lutheran Church. He continued to labor as theological professor, and from 1890 to 1893 he was connected with Augsburg Seminary in Minneapolis. From 1893 to 1912 he taught at the seminary of the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in St. Paul. After his retirement he lived in the last-named city. He was a prolific writer, especially in the rôle of editor. In 1883 the degree of Doctor of Theology had been conferred on him by Capital University. He died at the ripe age of ninety-one.

Andover Seminary — a Warning Example. — In connection with the controversy raging about Princeton Seminary at present a writer in the *Presbyterian* draws attention to the history of Andover Seminary, founded as a Congregationalist school in opposition to Harvard, which contains weighty lessons for all who are concerned about the type of doctrine taught in our theological schools. Professor Faulkner of Drew Seminary is quoted as follows: "That historic row of buildings on Andover Hill, that fine campus with its beautiful line

of elms, that magnificent Brechin Hall library building, the gymnasium — all . . . in 1908 went to Cambridge. It became a kind of *protégé* of the Unitarian College, which cast it out in 1805. It was the grimmest piece of irony in history, as one of its graduates said. The inevitable happened. . . . In June, 1922, to save itself from extinction, it merged itself with that school to become the Theological School in Harvard University. Such is the tragic end of a glorious history, an end full of instruction and of warning, so plain that he who runs may read." "For seventy-five years (1807—1882) no school of its kind had a nobler history or lent more glory to its benefactors. It was among the first experiments of a regular theological seminary. . . . Students flocked to Andover from all lands and from all Protestant denominations." "Her professors, for nearly a century, shed immortal light on her, on theological science, and on the whole Church of Christ. Her light went out into all the world. . . . Her graduates, from the very beginning, went forth into heathen lands, Christianized and civilized whole races, and later went also into our whole West and planted academies, colleges, and theological schools, built churches, and evangelized large portions of our land. She became the model of every theological school in America. . . . Yes, she had a glorious history."

How did all this happen? Dr. Faulkner says: "The orthodoxy of no school in the history of the world was ever more sacredly and carefully guarded by human ingenuity than was done in this case by the high-minded, far-seeing, and generous founders of Andover Seminary." There were some strict provisions, which seemed to be adequate to keep the Faculty on the proper foundations. A special Board of Visitors had been provided, whose duty it was to see to it that the professors in the seminary remained loyal to their oath of subscription to the doctrinal standards. Every five years these subscriptions had to be repeated. Certain grave mistakes were made, however, which finally issued in complete disaster. First one, next two, and then more professors were employed who could not sincerely subscribe to the doctrinal standards. The faculty became divided, endless litigation resulted, and finally the property was entirely in the control of the Unitarian liberals. The Board of Trustees, which had the right to appoint teachers, was not careful. After it had placed two heretical professors on the faculty, it took but a short time until the Board of Visitors, which was entrusted with the sacred duty of guarding the orthodoxy of the school, became liberal itself.

Having read the presentation in the *Presbyterian,* we must say that there is no method devised by human ingenuity which can keep a school on the foundations of the Scriptures, — the Spirit of God has to do it. We see, however, that it is a dangerous thing to place control of a school in the hands of a few men, because they so easily take an attitude different from that of the church-body which they are supposed to represent.

Let Modernists Be Honest. — It is strange that people should be so slow in perceiving that common honesty demands that they leave their church-body if they no longer agree with its doctrines and

principles. The world sees it, even if the theologian maintains he does not. The *Presbyterian* draws attention to an editorial in the *National Republic,* where this matter is discussed. Says the editor of the *National Republic:* "For a clergyman to remain within the membership and even the ministry of a Church whose doctrines he repudiates is evidence of a lack of stamina which must fall beneath the contempt of all normal-minded men and women. To be willing to take advantage of the opportunity for a hearing afforded by such profession and at the same time to use it for the purpose of subverting or destroying the institution to which he ostensibly yields allegiance, is a violation of the tenets of common honesty. . . . It is about time for the rank and file of the churches of this country to rise up and demand that their disloyalists be required to do what honorable men need not be asked to do — get out under their own flag and fight from the side of the breastworks on which they belong rather than to seek betrayal of the camp from within. Unless such rebellion is raised, vast injury is sure to be done to the cause of religion within the next few years."

In commenting on the editorial statement quoted above, the writer in the *Presbyterian* alludes to one of his own experiences. "In an unguarded moment one of the foremost ministers in our Church reproved the writer sharply in the presence of a brilliant and noted Liberal by saying, in reference to the doubts injected into the minds of students in the seminary by their professors: 'It is perfectly preposterous to put a man into the seminary and then tell him what he is to say. He should be left perfectly free to say what he believes.' This same preacher gave an address before a meeting of known Conservative ministers, in which he noisily affirmed every solemn and difficult phrase of the Apostles' Creed. One audience was Liberal, and so a Liberal pronouncement. The other was Conservative, and so the full Gospel declaration. Paul speaks of not handling the Word of God deceitfully, and it is this utmost honesty and sincerity to which we here recall our own hearts and lips."

The Catholic Doctrine of Intention. — Oliver Chase Quick, an Anglo-Catholic, in *The Christian Sacraments,* published 1927, brings up "the difficulties of Catholic theologians" about this doctrine in this wise: "*Some* doctrine of intention there must be if the Christian Sacraments are to be saved from the absurdities, and worse than absurdities, of magic. But the Augustinian theory of validity seems to make the Sacrament, on its human side, depend upon the *personal* rather than upon the *official* action of the minister, and therefore to require a *private* intention in the minister's own mind to perform the Sacrament and not merely a *publicly expressed* intention, for which the apparent fact that a man is acting in an official capacity is sufficient evidence. In this antithesis we have roughly indicated the point at issue between those theologians who require 'interior intention' in the minister of a Sacrament and those who hold that 'exterior intention' is enough. In the Roman Communion the necessity of interior intention is now generally accepted in spite of the weighty arguments of Salmeron and Catharinus, which have been revived and

restated by Dr. Langford James in his recent monograph *The Doctrine of Intention.* At first sight this is strange; for the difficulties of the now prevalent doctrine are obvious. It necessitates the almost intolerable conclusion that in the last resort the minister can render the Sacrament invalid simply by forming, and adhering in his own mind to, a contrary intention while he outwardly performs the sacramental acts" (p. 157 f.). There are various sorts of difficulties about this doctrine. Those Catholic theologians who hold that the "interior intention" in the minister of a Sacrament is not required will experience great difficulty in reconciling their view with the clear statements of their creed. The *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* declare: "If any one saith that in ministers, when they effect and confer the Sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." (Sess. VII, Can. XI.) "The penitent ought not so to confide in his own personal faith as to think that — even though there be no contribution on his part or no intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously and absolving truly — he is nevertheless truly and in God's sight absolved on account of his faith alone." (Sess. XIV, chap. VI.) "If any one saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses, provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke, . . . let him be anathema." (Sess. XIV, Can. IX.) Unless these theologians can delete these canons from their creed, we shall have to consider them as under the anathema of their Church. The difficulties besetting the other party of Catholic theologians are presented by Cardinal Bellarmine in this cold-blooded manner: "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true Sacrament because the Sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, and no man can see another's intention." (Littledale, p. 22.) It will prove a most difficult task to convince the devout Catholic that he received a true absolution, seeing that the mental attitude of the priest is made an essential factor in the efficacy of the sacrament of penance. Roman writers may minimize as much as possible the likelihood that even a bad priest would act without intention, — it will prove difficult to get the devout Catholic to trust in the goodness of a bad priest. Another difficulty: Do the bulls and encyclicals of the present Pontiff carry any weight? Unless he is a true priest, he cannot act as Pope, the infallible head of the Church. But is he a priest? Who saw the intention of the bishop administering the sacrament of order? Every good Catholic is bound to receive his encyclicals with doubts and misgivings, under pain of being anathematized by his Church. And what about those theologians who, for going against the plain teachings of their Church, have been laboring under the anathema, and now, penitently accepting the teaching, go to the Pope to be absolved from the guilt and punishment of the anathema? The Pope will remove the anathema; but having honestly accepted the Tridentine canons, they are bound to tell him that they cannot receive his absolution "with the certainty

of faith," — and upon that the Pope will at once restore the anathema. It certainly is a difficult affair. And there are other and much more serious difficulties. Says Dr. Dallmann: "For lack of intention on the part of a baptizing priest the boy is never baptized; the boy, when grown, enters the Church, but he never becomes a priest, and every priestly act of his is null and void; those he ordains are no more priests than himself; all their acts are not valid; he becomes Pope, but lacks the infallibility, and so the Church loses her head and becomes a corpse. On his own principles no Romanist can say with certainty that there is a true catholic and apostolic Church on the earth to-day." (*Theol. Quart.*, XIV, p. 94.) — However, the Catholic Church knows how to deal efficiently with the difficulties her teachings present to her thinking sons. It requires them to make the *sacrificium intellectus* — and all difficulties vanish. E.

Superstition Still Fostered by Rome. — *Our Sunday Visitor* explains on its "Children's Page" what is meant by the Agnus Dei. On the Wednesday of Holy Week, so we are told, the Pope blesses the Agnus Dei, which is made of wax from the paschal candle of the preceding years. "This wax is made in small molds, and on one side is impressed the figure of a lamb and on the other the image of a saint. They are immersed in water especially blessed by the Holy Father. Then each little piece is enclosed in linen covered with silk or white leather. These are distributed all over the Catholic world and are treasured by those who devoutly recall the Paschal Lamb, Jesus, who suffered for our sins. . . . During the pontificate of St. Pius V the river Tiber overflowed its banks and threatened destruction to several parts of Rome. An Agnus Dei was thrown into the river, and the waters immediately went down." Let no one say that gross superstition is no longer found in the Roman Church.

The Power of Prejudice. — The *Biblical Review* for April, 1928, contains a fine article by Dr. A. McCaig, entitled "Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own Death." It deals with the substitutionary and redemptive nature of Christ's death. It insists on taking the words of Scripture as they read. It refuses to depart, for rationalistic considerations, from the plain sense of the words. We transcribe a few paragraphs: "The strong preposition used [in Matt. 20, 28] intensifies the idea of ransom and expiation, even to the point of substitution; *ὑπέρ*, 'on behalf of,' is frequently used in connection with the death of Christ, and those who deny the expiatory and substitutionary nature of His sufferings will have it that it is used in a loose, general way, 'for the benefit of.'" (Robertson, by the way, points out that in some passages *ὑπέρ* cannot mean anything else than "instead," and "only violence to the text can get rid of it." For instance, Gal. 3, 13. Try to make it mean "for the benefit of" in Philemon 13! Or in 2 Cor. 5, 20! — The article continues:) "But here the preposition is *ἀντί*, and 'instead of' is its proper rendering; and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution, cannot be removed from it. In Num. 3, 45: 'Take the Levites *instead* of the first-born,' the Septuagint uses *ἀντί*, which, like the English 'instead of,' exactly represents

the Hebrew *takhath,* and all three convey most unmistakably the idea of substitution. As the Levites were to be substituted for the first-born, so for the surplus of the first-born, the 'ransom-money' was to be substituted, that idea, however, being clearly enough indicated by the genitive. Indeed, the more appropriate and the simpler way of describing a ransom would be with the genitive — the ransom of many, or, as our version renders, 'a ransom *for* many'; but just because the ransom here is not a mere money payment, but is the actual sacrifice of the life, the substitution of His soul, He is appropriately said to 'give His soul a ransom *instead of* many.'" On the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper: "The additional statement that His blood was shed for the remission of sins, makes it still more evident. The blood of the covenant typically and figuratively procures forgiveness for the people through the shedding of Christ's blood; the new covenant is ratified, and perfect forgiveness is actually secured for His people — not for Jews alone, but 'for many.' The words are so plain that only a mind filled with prejudice or preconceived theories could fail to apprehend the meaning, to see that in some way, at least, the death of Christ was to procure forgiveness, that this was indeed His purpose in dying, and not a mere incidental or mysterious and inexplicable effect. Nothing less than atoning, vicarious, redeeming efficacy is thus attributed to the blood of Christ. It is, indeed, very noteworthy that the atoning virtue is not attributed to the teaching, the influence, of Christ, but to His death, His shed blood. It is hard to see how any theory of the Atonement which sets aside the true expiatory character of the death of Christ can be reconciled with these words."

It is strange that a writer who over against the objections of the rationalists so tenaciously clings to the native meaning of the words could pen, in this very connection, these words: "In instituting His memorial feast, He says, 'This is My body,' 'given for you,' 'take, eat,' thus showing the significance of His death. 'Given' tells of surrender unto death, 'for you' proclaims the sacrificial and substitutionary character, while the eating of the symbolical body tells of the nourishment which communion with Him affords." How does it happen that the writer substitutes *symbolical body* for "This is My body," "given for you," so easily, unconcernedly, unhesitatingly? The symbolical body was not given for us. The writer will not suffer himself to become biased by any rationalistic prejudice when studying the Atonement. Why should the Reformed-rationalistic prejudice influence him when studying the words of the Institution? "The words are so plain that only a mind filled with prejudice or preconceived theories could fail to apprehend the meaning." E.

A National Communist College. — The *Lutheran Companion,* as quoted by the *Lutheran Standard,* reports that a National Communist College has been formally opened in New York City by the central executive committee of the Workers' Communist Party, with the avowed purpose "to teach the art and science, the tactics and strategy, of militant revolution."

The course can be covered in three months, and during that time the students will be paid a fee of ten dollars a week. The faculty includes Wm. Z. Foster, Ben Gold, Bertram D. Wolfe, and more than twenty others. In his address at the opening of the school, Mr. Foster said that the present leaders of labor organization are "corrupt and in the pay of the capitalist." Evidently this new effort is designed to teach young Communists a morality which money cannot corrupt.

The subjects included in the course of instruction are: Marxism and Leninism, trade-union organization, American political problems, economics, organization methods, labor journalism, statistical methods of research, and the history of American and international labor methods. Students will study during the day and gain practical information by visiting meetings and offices of trade-unions and radical organizations by night. As announced, they come not only from the Eastern States, but also from the Middle West and the Pacific Coast.

"There is no announcement of a course in explosives," says the *Rock Island Argus*, "but doubtless some competent 'professor' will train neophites in the scientific handling of dynamite bombs. This nest of Communists will send out fledglings from time to time and do what they can to disturb the present social order. It may be that some will take postgraduate courses in penitentiaries."

The *Lutheran Companion* closes the report with the remark: "Who says that the powers of destruction are not active? Who says that all this writing in the press about dethroning God and enthroning license, disorder, riot, and destruction of the powers that be is mere newspaper talk? Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This eternal vigilance must include also the Modernist and the evolutionist, who by their pernicious teachings destroy the morality of the nation; the corrupt politician, who is willing to betray the highest interest of his country for money; and last, but not least, the perverted judge and the lawyer who hold that criminality is only a disease and therefore intercept and prevent the punishment which the ever-increasing multitude of criminals deserves. Communism strikes its root in a people that has forsaken God and His Law. MUELLER.

Christianity and Woman. — Christians in our country and the world over recently were horrified when an American woman embraced Hinduism in order to marry a prominent Hindu prince. The *Gospel Herald* offers the following warning with reference to this and other "conversions" to foreign religions: "When God formed Eve and presented her to Adam, He designed that she should be a helpmeet. But every religion and philosophy in the world since, except Christianity, has failed to adhere to this purpose. Even many sects which hold nominal Bible views miserably fail in domestic relationships for the same reason that Christ gave, 'because of the hardness of your hearts.' This God-given place for woman was quickly lost after the expulsion from Eden. It was somewhat restored among the Hebrews and has since reached its highest degree of realization in the various periods of this dispensation when Christianity has enjoyed its greatest purity. For this reason, if for no other, every woman in the world ought to be an enthusiastic, faithful Christian; for apart

from Christ her chances for obtaining her natural rights and privileges are utterly hopeless. . . .

"The catchy book philosophy of the Hindu poets and pundits traps the unspiritual minds even of English and Americans, who see nothing but the ethical ideals and none of the vile degradation which is universally prevalent in Hindu life and worship. . . .

"The American bride . . . will discover that her husband may have a quartet of wives according to his religion and that he will quickly give her the lowest place and the least attention if she does not come up to his ideals. If she disappoints him in any one of five ways, he can simply say, 'Thou art divorced,' and her meteoric honeymoon will suddenly end without redress or alimony. Her new religion will teach her that a man may lie in three cases, 'to woman, to reconcile friends, and in war'; and lying to women was placed first, while, on the other hand, he may divorce her if she lies to him. She will face the lack of home love such as she knew in America; her liberties will be seriously cut off; she will be torn with jealousy and crushed by the ignorance of the women with whom she must associate. . . .

"The fad for marriage romance which has captured many in these latter days has caused untold soul anguish, moral turpitude, and spiritual bankruptcy. The idea that all religions can give soul peace to their followers has been accepted by some as a mark of tolerance and has led not a few into breaking off their interest in Christ and taking up religious teachings which have engulfed whole continents and made nations grovel in immoral gutters for thousands of years.

"If the non-Christian religions of the world had been able to do what Christianity has done, why did they not do it before Christ came? He knew their powerlessness and said to His disciples: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. . . . He that believeth not shall be damned.' Mark 16, 15. 16. This last statement puts Christ's seal of disapproval upon them all and marks them as beliefs to be avoided. His correctness in this attitude is clearly demonstrated and proved by the home life under the different religions. Christianity is the only religion that establishes and maintains the atmosphere of divine love, peace, and equality. This is simply because it came from God and not from the imaginative human mind.

"The woman who forsakes Christianity for any non-Christian religion will very soon find that she has sold her soul and body for a mess of sour pottage. She may imagine at first that she is going to find some new light, but she will quickly discover that Christ spoke a great warning truth when He said: 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!'" MUELLER.

Pacifism, Just Wars, and War Lust. — The report of a committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, published February 17, enunciates principles which our statesmen — and our people — would do well to study. It rejects the proposition that "all employment of force among nations is immoral." Only a sovereign power possesses the right to make a just war, it declared, and it added,

"equally obvious is a just intention." "Even though engaged in justifiable warfare," the report continues, "a state should not include wrongful ends among its objectives. A state may make war to safeguard its rights, actually violated or in certain or imminent danger. Hence a war is not morally justified which aims at extending national territory, enhancing national power and prestige, promoting an international 'balance of power,' or forestalling some hypothetical or merely probable menace. — Utterly inadequate are the formulations, 'the good of the community,' 'public peace,' 'necessity,' and similar general terms which can be, and have been, used as pretexts for unnecessary wars. Moreover, legitimate defense of rights implies that the aggrieved state is not simultaneously violating the right of the state against which it contemplates war. — The violation of national rights must appear to the aggrieved state as morally certain. No degree of probability, not even a great preponderance of probability, is sufficient. A declaration of war is equivalent to a sentence of death; to pronounce the latter with a doubtful conscience is murder. — Neither actual violation of national rights nor moral certainty about it, nor both combined, are sufficient to make war lawfully moral. War, particularly in modern times, inflicts so many, so various, and such enormous injuries upon innocent and guilty alike that it cannot be justified except by very grave reasons, by the gravest known to human society. — Even though all three of the foregoing conditions are fulfilled, a declaration of war is not justified. Recourse to war is not justified until all peaceful methods have been tried and found inadequate. The principal pacific means are: direct negotiation, diplomatic pressure of various kinds, boycotts and rupture of normal international intercourse, and mediation, and arbitration. — If all these fail, the calm, deliberate judgment of the people rather than the aims of the ambitious few should decide whether war is the only solution. — A government should have solid reasons, proportionate to the evil alternative of defeat, for expecting victory. — It is the duty of a government to promote peace both as an obligation of justice to its citizens and as an obligation of charity to other peoples," etc. As to the degree of preparedness which the government is justified in maintaining (also discussed in the report), the writer and perhaps all other laymen are hardly in a position to form a right judgment. There also may be a question as to specific applications of the principles, as set down in the report, but the principles themselves should be earnestly studied by our statesmen — and the press and the people. The Catholic Association is, on this matter, in substantial agreement with Luther: "Since the sword is given by God to punish the evil-doers, to shield the good, and to maintain peace, Rom. 13, 1 ff.; 1 Pet. 2, 13 ff., that establishes invincibly that warring and killing is sanctioned by God and everything that war and the laws of war imply. For what is war other than punishing injustice and evil?" "This I will say first of all: he that begins war is in the wrong, and it is right that he be vanquished or, at any rate, be finally punished who first draws the knife. — Government is not ordained by God for the purpose that it should break peace and begin

war. — Of such the Lord declares, Ps. 68, 31: 'Scatter Thou the people that delight in war.'" "You must distinguish between two kinds of war; the first, a war undertaken freely and wilfully, before one is attacked; the other, a war forced upon one by the attack of the other. The first may be called war lust; the second, a war of necessity. The first is the devil's; let God not bless it; the second, a misfortune; God be with it." "Therefore mark well, dear sirs, keep away from war, unless it becomes your duty to guard and protect and your office forces you to go to war. In that case do not hesitate, smite with might; be men and use your armor." (X, 492. 513. 515.) "It is well and needful to have fortified cities and castles, good armor and munition, against the foe. But it is also well that a prince should build a peace castle, that is, that he should desire peace and maintain peace at home. For the Romans themselves, the greatest warriors of all times, say that to undertake a needless war is like fishing with a golden hook, which, if lost, could not be paid for by the business; and if it resulted in a catch, the cost would be larger than the gain. You must not begin and plan war; it will come unbidden, and all too soon. Preserve peace as long as you can. Victory will in no case restore what is lost through war." (Erl. Ed., 39, 244.) "A good, worth-while soldier is so minded that he would rather preserve one citizen and friend than destroy a thousand enemies. So said Scipio, the heathen, Rome's foremost general. No true soldier will begin a war lightly and without grave reason." (22, 1452.) "What a fearful delusion it is that men should rejoice over the carnage, butchery, blood, murder, and the whole mass of disaster that is bound up with war, to praise and celebrate it, when it behooves us to shed bloody tears over it all, especially when the war is not waged by God's will, but from an insane lust after dominion and possessions, as the heathen have done and are still doing, and to-day, alas! the Christians, the men of peace, the children of God, are doing more barbarously than the heathen." (4, 894.) E.

A Waste of Precious Time. — There are no doubt many Christians who sympathize with the editor of the *Watchman-Examiner* when he complains of the waste of precious time at church services. He writes: "Recently we attended a church service at which the pastor introduced every hymn, every Scripture-reading, every anthem, and every other part of the service with 'appropriate' remarks. The consequence was that an hour was used up, and the people, too, before he reached his sermon. Evidently that pastor thinks that he is paid for his much speaking. We are certain that his people would let him off with less. The truth is that he spoiled a beautiful service with his little sermonettes. He spoiled the effect of his sermon also because everybody was fidgety to get home to dinner by the time the sermon was begun. What a pity it is that that man cannot understand the value of time and learn not to fritter it away! We are making no plea for short services or short sermons, although we might make a plea for both of them. We are simply pleading that pastors will conduct the service of worship in a dignified and straightforward

way without interpolating too many of their own side-remarks. When these side-remarks are unusual, they are sometimes very delightful. When they are continuous, they are nerve-racking." MUELLER.

Concerning the Ancient Hittites. — Regarding this interesting people mentioned in the Bible we find the following interesting item in the *Australian Lutheran:* "Children of the Hittite race who went to school in Asia Minor about 1000 B. C. had to learn dead languages just as the modern schoolboy learns Latin. Baked clay tablets found in the capital city of the ancient Hittite empire have been deciphered by scholars, who say that eight languages are represented on them, written in the neat, wedge-shaped characters known as cuneiform writing.

"The Sumerian language was then long dead, but the Hittites learned it and taught it to their children because they believed that charms sung in the old language were peculiarly effective. In some of the tablets the Sumerian text is followed by columns containing the same text translated into the official Hittite language and into Babylonian, and also a column pronouncing the Sumerian words. Babylonian was apparently the language of diplomacy among the Hittites.

"Several thousand tablets were discovered in a palace, and in a temple used as a record office, by German archeologists some years ago; but early attempts at reading them were hampered because the different languages were not sorted out. Writers of long records on the baked tablets were careful to indicate the sequence from one tablet to the next, and usually at the end of the document the author wrote his name, his profession, and place of residence in modern fashion."

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

According to the *Australian Lutheran* the rector of Willcannia, New South Wales, who has a parish as large as England, will use an aeroplane to visit the various points of his far-flung parish. A Moth machine will be used.

In 1925 the Eastern Theological Seminary was organized, the intention of the founders being to make and keep it a conservative school of theology. It belongs to the Baptists. During its second year it had an enrolment of 137; the third year, 153. The school is located in the heart of Philadelphia, on Rittenhouse Square.

Speaking of the clash between the Pope and Mussolini, the Catholic paper *America* remarks: "The Premier is probably a busy man at the present moment. A storm is on the horizon; but whatever duties claim him, he will do well to retire to some secluded retreat and there meditate on the phrase, so old that men cannot trace its authorship: '*Qui mange du Pape meurt*' (He who 'swallows' the Pope dies)." We believe it.

According to the statement of Dr. C. F. Graebner, Concordia College in Australia is attended by 98 students. The school has more than 300 alumni, and the venerable president says that only a very small percentage of them have left the Church. Since 1913 fifty-six pastors were graduated, and fifty-three of them are still in the ministry. This is a remarkable record.

Christianity is making some headway among the Moslems of Galilee. At Shefamer there has been a little group of native Christians for some time. Recently, so one of our exchanges says, representatives from perhaps forty Moslem families have been attending the services, and half a year ago, one Sunday morning, there waited outside the church a group of thirty men who said to the deacon that they wished to become Christians.

America quotes the *Rutland* (Vt.) *Herald* as an opponent of the Curtis-Reed Federal Education Bill. This paper, in spite of being Republican in its politics, considers this bill as approving dangerous encroachments on the rights of the States. It says: "The time to make a stand against Federal aggression is on this obnoxious and pestilential bill for a Federal Department of Education."

Why a decline of ministerial candidates? The *Presbyterian* says: "Commercialism and materialism are depriving the Church of the ablest brains and energies of the land." It adds: "The greatest influence to-day that is at work among the thoughtful young men is the agnosticism that is so prevalent, the spirit of uncertainty, and the whole history of destructive criticism. When men feel the great realities, they will answer the call."

It is reported that Dr. John Timothy Stone of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, has accepted the presidency of McCormick Theological Seminary in that city. McCormick is a Presbyterian school.

Judge W. H. S. Thomson, of Pittsburgh, when asked for an injunction in favor of the Klan, declared: "This unlawful organization, so destructive of the rights and liberties of the people, has come in vain asking this court of equity for injunctive or other relief. They come with filthy hands and can get no assistance here."

The following item found in *America* deserves to be passed on. Speaking of the efforts which certain bishops in the Protestant Episcopal Church are making to reunite all Christianity, a layman asked the question, "Why do these gentlemen work so hard to secure world unity and do nothing apparently to secure unity in their own dioceses?"

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly. Official Organ of the Concordia Historical Institute, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. Editor-in-Chief: *Prof. W. G. Polack.* Associate Editors: *Prof. Th. Graebner, Prof. R. W. Heintze.* Subscription: 25 cts. the copy; $1.00 a year. Payable strictly in advance. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Due to an oversight the appearance of this contemporary was not announced earlier in these pages. The first number of this *Quarterly* contains an introductory editorial, an account of important business transactions of the Concordia Historical Institute, several other matters pertaining to the organization, and a few valuable articles, one of them a biographical sketch of Pastor F. W. Husmann, another an account of the diary of Paul Henkel, which is one of the treasures of the Concordia Historical Institute Museum; furthermore, the beginning of a series of articles on early Lutherans and Lutheran churches in America by Rev. Karl Kretzmann; finally, two pictures, accompanied by short articles, one of Jefferson Ave. and Miami St., St. Louis, showing how things looked there about sixty years ago; the other depicting the treasure-chest in our museum in which the Saxon immigrants brought their money to America. Likewise the photograph of an account book of these immigrants is reproduced, showing entries from September, 1838, to June, 1845. Altogether, the *Quarterly*, a little magazine of twenty-four pages, but richly illustrated, well printed, and ably edited, is exceedingly worth

while and goes out into the world with our best wishes. We hope that many will subscribe for it and through its agency will become more fervent in their love of our dear Lutheran Church and show greater willingness to sacrifice for it. It ought to be added that a subscription for the *Quarterly* is included in the fees of membership in the Institute, namely, active, $2 per annum; sustaining, $5 per annum; life, $100, single payment.

Das Neue Testament mit in den Text eingeschalteter Auslegung, ausfuehrlichen Inhaltsangaben und erlaeuternden Bemerkungen. Herausgegeben von *August Daechsel.* Zweite Haelfte: Lehr- und prophetische Buecher. Erste Abteilung: Die Briefe der heiligen Apostel. Zweite Abteilung: Die Offenbarung St. Johannis nebst einem Sachregister zum gesamten Bibelwerk. Mit acht Holzschnitten. $4.50. (A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., Leipzig, Germany.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is Vol. VII of the monumental commentary on the Bible known as *Daechsels Bibelwerk*, and it concludes the set. It is a colossal volume of more than one thousand pages, offering copious comments on the sacred text under consideration. As in the other volumes, the auther often quotes prominent theologians. Thus on the difficult verse Jude 14 he submits a paragraph from Stier and another one from v. Hofmann. What is so appealing in this work is that the writer wishes to place himself squarely on the Scriptures, believing in their inspired, divine character. The discussions of important passages are so extended that a pastor is furnished a great amount of material for his sermons in them. In addition, themes on the pericopes of the church-year, together with their divisions, are submitted. The work, then, can well be declared to be extraordinarily useful to theologians. It is to be regretted that, as far as doctrine is concerned, the author favors Chiliasm and in this volume even strongly champions it.

Paul's Hymn of Love. First Corinthians Thirteen, an Interpretation. By *Charles R. Erdman,* Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Princeton, N. J. 64 pages. 75 cts. (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.)

Professor Erdman is favorably known as the author of several expository works on the New Testament, written chiefly for laymen. The present volume adds another contribution to his list of books and is a helpful and inspiring explanation of Paul's great hymn of love. It is scholarly, though popular; exhaustive, though concise; devotional, though sober and objective. Four translations are offered for the benefit of those who do not understand the original: the American Revised Version, the King James Version, and the versions of James Moffatt and of R. F. Weymouth. The five chapters bear the following heads: A Hymn of Love; Love Indispensable; Love Made Manifest; Love Imperishable; Love Preeminent. The author's interpretation of "the gift of tongues" is, no doubt, the correct one. He writes: "This gift, so difficult to define, was not the ability to speak in foreign languages, an enduement which seems to have been granted to the Christians at Pentecost. It was rather a power of ecstatic, inarticulate utterance, which could be understood only by one who had the

corresponding gift of 'interpretation of tongues.' Probably it was popular because so surprising and spectacular that its recipients became conspicuous, admired or envied, among their fellow-Christians."

MUELLER.

The Life of Paul. By *Benjamin Willard Robinson, Ph. D.*, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary. $2.00. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

The publishers say of this work: "First printed in 1918, the book has gone through eight impressions and has achieved a foremost position among text-books dealing with the life of Paul." The new edition of the work before us appeared in February of this year. We can understand that the book, on account of its orderly arrangement of the material, its clear presentation, and the bibliography at the end of each chapter, lends itself admirably to the purposes of the classroom. Dr. Robinson does not belong to the ultraradical school of critics. He might be classed as a conservative liberal. Thus he considers Ephesians to be genuine, and his defense of the authenticity of this grand epistle, while very brief, is nevertheless convincing. (He holds it to be the letter to the Laodiceans, mentioned Col. 4, 16.) Concerning the genuineness of the pastoral epistles, however, he has his doubts. On the conversion of Paul the words of the apostle and the account of St. Luke are followed closely. Dr. Robinson is convinced of the trustworthiness of the narratives in the Book of Acts. Now and then the wrong theological position of the author becomes evident, for instance, when he says, p. 237: "This is salvation, not the doing of any acts in accordance with any schedule of duty or law, but the ennobling of the soul through the contact of the Spirit of God in Jesus." There he, as is done so commonly nowadays, confuses justification and sanctification.

The Study Bible. Edited by *John Stirling*, assisted by *Dean W. R. Inge, Prof. J. Moffatt, Prof. A. S. Peake, Canon B. H. Streeter*, etc. Volumes submitted for review: on Mark, Luke, Romans, Hebrews, Genesis, and Psalms. *Each volume* ca. 145 pages. $1.25. (Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc., New York.)

The religious book market is being flooded to-day with many works for which the reviewer allows space only for the purpose of warning against them. *The Study Bible* belongs to this class of literary productions. It is edited by men noted for both leadership and scholarship. The plan followed in arranging the material is novel and attractive. Each volume has two contributors, one who writes the devotional and inspirational material, and the other who furnishes the critical and historical supplement. The notes and comments are drawn from the writings of scholars, Christian and non-Christian, in all periods of Christian history, so that each volume is not only a commentary, but also a symposium of some value. These commendable features will no doubt secure for the *Study Bible* many purchasers, perhaps also among conservative Bible students. The attention of such students must be called to the two outstanding dangers that confront the orthodox truth-seeker. First, the comments, being taken from both believing and unbelieving scholars, present a jumble of truth and falsehood, in most cases downright contra-

dictory and therefore hopelessly confusing. Quite frequently, too, the comments are wrested from their context and therefore do not establish the clear meaning of the text. Also, in many instances, the comments are too general and do not expound the text. To illustrate, *sub* Rom. 3, 28 — the Authorized Version has been discarded — Schaff's comment on faith reads: "Faith comes into view simply as the means which apprehends and appropriates Christ." This is correct. Faith justifies only as an instrument which receives the merits of Christ, for whose sake the believing sinner is declared righteous. Next follows Cardinal Newman's definition of faith, which reads: "It [faith] is the frame of mind especially suited to it, and it is said, in a special way, to justify us, because it glorifies God, witnessing that He accepts those only who confess they are not worthy to be accepted." This is the Roman Catholic definition of faith, which regards faith as a work of merit and according to which faith saves as a good quality, or as a virtue. Both definitions are given without any comment which might help the student in his search for the truth, and unless he is firmly established in the faith and extremely critical, he is liable to be confused and choose the wrong interpretation rather than the correct one. Secondly, the critical discussions of each book of the Bible are written from the extreme rationalistic viewpoint. In the critical discussion on Genesis the contributor still advocates the documentary theory of Wellhausen, Graf, and others, though long ago that impossible theory has been proved false. Other critical discussions are similar in their unbelief and departure from the divine truth. Our pastors will certainly not be helped by the study of the *Study Bible.* J. T. M.

The Words and Deeds of Jesus. Book 3. The Continuous Story. From the Records by Matthew and John. Translated from the Greek into modern English and arranged for study by *Edwin Faxon Osborn.* $1.50. (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.)

This book, printed in beautiful large type, on excellent paper, gives the text of Matthew and John in a new translation, based on the text of Westcott and Hort. The author says that in preparing the text he has compared numerous modern translations, particularly those of E. J. Goodspeed, J. Moffatt, and the Committee of the Twentieth Century New Testament. "But the American Revised Version, the Douay Version, and the King James Version have been followed in so far as has been found consistent with modern English. The older translations have been given precedence, because a commendable sentiment regarding them is often offended by changes that are not necessary to better understanding." This particular volume is intended for use in the public schools, where it is to be read and recited without comment or discussion. The fact that it was prepared for children has induced the author to employ simpler language than is used in other volumes of this series. It seems to me that Dr. Osborn, who, by the way, is a Greek scholar of recognized standing, being professor at Ann Arbor, has not always given the right order of events; perhaps he was not so much concerned about this as about incorporating everything Matthew and John contain. Whether it is wise to place a modern translation of the Bible into the hands of our children rather than the King James Version seems very doubtful to me. But still more am I constrained

to doubt the advisability of the plan of reading the Scriptures in the public schools. It is true, the teacher is instructed to refuse answering doctrinal questions and to refer the inquirer to his pastor. Will that be feasible? Will it be done? Besides, when the Bible is read under circumstances where it cannot be treated as the Bible, is not probably the harm done greater than the good that is achieved?

Jesus the Citizen. By *James Alex. Robertson, M. A., D. D.* $2.00. (Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York.)

The author says in the preface: "All that this little book sets out to do is to try to make one aspect of the Career, Jesus' contact with the cities Nazareth, Capernaum, Jerusalem, stand out for the reader from the rest a little more clearly than before. It tries to answer such questions as, How He broke through the evils in His city environment, How He responded to the call of home, What position He took as a worker with His hands, Why He was drawn into the vortex of city life, In what ways the cities reacted to this unprecedented outlook on life, and How He died at last, outside a city wall, for the difference between right and wrong." A reading of the book bears out that we are here not given a discussion of the deep mysteries relating to Jesus, His deity and His vicarious atonement, but of the things that lay on the surface, His holiness, love, willingness to help the poor and needy, etc. Dr. Robertson is an artist, who writes with rare felicity of phrase and imagination. From the doctrinal point of view, however, the book is not satisfactory.

Life Beyond the Grave. The state of the soul between death and resurrection. By *the Rev. J. J. Knap.* 199 pages. $1.50. (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The translator of Rev. Knap's book, Rev. K. Bergsma, says: "The Rev. Knap, of the city of Groningen, Netherlands, is a minister in the Established Church (*Hervormde Kirk*) and a leader among the orthodox group of that Church. He naturally gives the orthodox, or *fundamental*, view, as we say at present in America. It has been a joy to translate the Rev. Knap's book." And it will yield much joy and instruction to the reader. Its simple language, forceful presentation of important Scripture truths, and warmth of feeling appeal to the Bible Christian. "Christ is the Way through His redemptive sacrifice." "We are received as children of the King in the royal court, not because of any merit of ours, but through grace." "The way of salvation is still open for the greatest sinner." Also this: "... earth in its creation in six days." "This theory [evolutionism as applied to morals] is repulsive to any one who fears the Lord." "There is no book in the Old Testament in which you do not find some gleam of eternity." As to the matter in hand, our author presents these two canons: "Our feelings may never decide how we shall explain the Scriptures." "We should not inquire curiously concerning the things the Lord in His wisdom has hidden from us." Accordingly, he rejects the dreams concerning "the intermediate, heavenly body of the soul before the resurrection," concerning "the soul-sleep," concerning purgatory and the second probation. He lets Scripture speak and insists on its being heard.

Occasionally he forgets his canons. For instance: "The question which souls will dwell together in the same sphere or mansion in the Father's house in heaven is not easily answered." "Many mansions — that suggests the thought of diversity, which is found among the inhabitants of heaven as well as among those on earth." Particularly on the question of hades our author has completely forsaken Scripture ground and taken over the modern vagary entirely. "Both persons, Lazarus and Dives, are in the realm of the dead, which also in this parable is called 'hell' (hades). This 'hell,' or realm of the dead, has two main divisions, which are completely separated from each other. That part which is set aside for the saved is given the peculiar name of Abraham's bosom." And still: "Paradise, into which the angels carried Lazarus, and heaven are the same sphere." The geographical ideas on hades in the modern theory are rather confused. So also "the place where Dives was is the place of untold suffering for the damned." Yet he was not in hell; for hell in Scripture, says the author, is designated by the term "gehenna." "God's Word," our author says in this connection, "is clear in this matter." Indeed it is, but the hades theory is not. And whenever this theory obtrudes itself on the mind of our author, he forsakes his usual clear thinking. "This text [1 Pet. 3, 19] does not in any way teach that Jesus went into the realm of the dead." Why not? "We know where He went after His resurrection. He went into heaven!" (!!)

Besides, some of the specific Reformed errors crop out in this book. Rejecting the misinterpretation of 1 Pet. 3, 19 by the advocates of a second probation, it rejects, at the same time, the descent of Christ into hell as taught there. Christ's descent into hell is taken to mean His descent into the realm of the dead, not taught, indeed, in 1 Pet. 3, 19, but in other passages. The heaven of God's majesty is "a definite, local place." On the question whether grace is universal or particular the author speaks after the manner of the Heidelberg Catechism. "We believe in a Christ who has paid in full for the guilt of His people by His precious blood." "If you take the number of the redeemed as such, without making a comparison, then they are many." "It is a heavenly life of redeemed and angels together." Nowhere in the Heidelberg Catechism nor in this book do we find a statement to the effect that Christ redeemed the world. — Those of us who study Reformed literature overmuch will do well, when describing the Christians as "the redeemed" and "the saved," to apply all proper safeguards against any Calvinistic implications. — Guarding against these and similar errors, one may get much joy and profit from the study of this book. E.

How Do We Know? By *Cortland Myers, D. D., LL. D.* 118 pages. $1.00. (The Judson Press, Philadelphia.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a popular apologetic work, which seeks to answer such questions as the following: "How do we know there is a God?" "How do we know the Bible is the Word of God?" "How do we know that Jesus is the Son of God?" "How do we know we shall live forever with God?" The author addresses himself to simple readers and discusses these important questions in the simplest manner and in the spirit of piety and

reverence, from the viewpoint of a humble believer. Thus he concludes his chapter on "How do we know the Bible is the Word of God?" with the words: "The Bible is the Word of God. It proves itself, and we can prove it. Here God speaks." While the writer in the main relies on external proofs in demonstrating his points, such as the power of the Bible, the sublime personality of Christ, Christian experience, etc., he nevertheless constantly calls upon his readers to read the Bible, to believe in Christ, and to trust in the divine promises for certainty of salvation. This is a helpful little volume for any one afflicted with doubts; only it requires careful and critical reading; the reviewer would not subscribe to every statement and argument advanced in the book.

J. T. M.

The Christ We Know. By *Charles Fiske, D. D., L. H. D., LL. D.* 273 pages, 5×7½. $2.00 (Harper & Brothers, 1927.)

Bishop Fiske (Episcopal) of Central New York desires to introduce the reader "to the real Jesus Christ whom I love and serve and in whom I believe with all my heart" (p. IX). His book is an apologetic, directed against modern skepticism, the writer having in view principally those students of Scripture whose faith has become unsettled through naturalistic criticism. The bishop himself has not been uninfluenced in his theology by modernistic reconstructions of the Gospel story and evolutionistic philosophy. He maintains that the gospels themselves disprove "the theory of the verbal inspiration and literal inerrancy of Holy Scripture" (p. 215; cp. p. 137); and he does not consider it his task "to defend outworn theories about the bodily resurrection which defy ascertained facts" (p. 242). The Old Testament has an ingredient of myth and legend (p. 125), and Jehovah was at first "hardly more than a tribal deity" (p. 22). At the same time, Bishop Fiske upholds not the divinity simply, but the deity of Jesus Christ, the authenticity of the gospel narratives and also of the epistles, and the reality of Christ's miracles, — though he hedges on some of these. Jesus "gave His life a ransom for many. His death was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world" (p. 212). What could be more satisfying as a definition of the atonement? But, alas! If we but continue a few lines down the page, we happen upon this: "In the death of Christ, as in nothing else, we see the awfulness of sin and are brought to acknowledge the penalty that is its due," — the familiar moral influence theory of the atonement, which is certainly not the atonement of the gospels and of the epistles.

GRAEBNER.

Holy Communion Cyclopedia. By *the Rev. G. B. F. Hallock, D. D.* 290 pages, 5½×8¾. $3.00. (Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., New York.)

We cannot expect a pastor of the Reformed churches to be able to write a book on Communion that is acceptable to a Lutheran. In his foreword the author of this book says: "The aim has been to make the volume practically indispensable to every preacher, pastor, and theological student and without any limit as to denominations of Christians. The book is without denominational bias. It is intended to be interdenominational in application; for it is a composite piece of work, its selections being from leaders of the Church without partiality toward any one body of believers." Any book that is said to be "interdenominational" cannot ring true to the

truth of the Scriptures. We need not be surprised that in this book the Lord's Supper is treated merely as a "commemorative event" and as a "symbolical institution." On page 274 we find the following words: "Rev. Dr. Cumming, of London, says that in the Highlands of Scotland he once met a lady of noble birth who asked him if he believed in the 'real presence.' 'Certainly I do,' he said. 'I am very glad,' she replied, 'but you are the first Protestant clergyman I ever met with who did.' 'We attach different meanings to the same words,' said Dr. Cumming. 'I believe in the real presence of our Lord wherever two or three are gathered together in His name. I cannot believe as you do about the real presence when I consider the words "In remembrance of Me." Memory has to do with the past, with an absent friend. To eat and drink in remembrance of one who is actually present before one's eyes is an absurdity.'" We must warn our pastors against buying certain books simply because their title has appealed to them. Money spent for a good book is a good investment; money spent for a bad book is no investment at all. The purpose of our review column is to bring good books to the attention of our pastors and to encourage them to use good judgment in the purchase of books for their library.

FRITZ.

A Short Psychology of Religion. By *G. J. Jordan.* $1.50. (Harper & Brothers.)

Among all the books on the psychology of religion which the present reviewer has seen this is till now the most satisfactory. It is true that in this book also Christianity is not strictly represented as the absolute religion, and the author makes far too many concessions to false psychology and modern unbelief. Religious psychology must be objective and accept the fact of the supernatural. Moreover, religious psychology must accept the fact that Jesus was the greatest Psychologist that ever lived. Compare John 2 and Col. 2. Nevertheless, the fact that the author still accepts the Bible forms a sort of a golden thread throughout the presentation, and for that reason many of the conclusions are better than they would be if an out-and-out unbeliever had written the book. To any one who wishes to become familiar with the general field of religious psychology this book will serve that purpose fairly well. K.

Missionary Methods for Church and Home. By *Catharine S. Cronk.* $1.50. (The Fleming H. Revell Company.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is one of the most inspiring books on the study of missions which has ever come to the reviewer's desk. Almost every page offers some idea which can very well be adopted or adapted in the home, in the day-school, and in the Sunday-school. Some of the chapter heads will give an idea of the manner of presentation. Chapter 3 is entitled "Missions in the Home"; chapter 4 bears the heading "Soul-winning Methods." Then we have the ear-gate methods discussed as well as the eye-gate methods, and there is a chapter devoted to working by proxy. It would not do to begin to quote, for otherwise the discussion would become endless. Very few question-marks were placed, although one may occasionally differ with the author as to certain hints and suggestions. Altogether, the book is eminently worth while. K.

English Preachers and Preaching 1640—1670. By *Caroline Frances Richardson.* 359 pages, 5½×8. $2.50. (The Macmillan Company, New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House.

Interesting historical notes on English preachers during a certain period of the seventeenth century offer interesting reading-material, which makes not only good pastime reading, but also teaches some valuable lessons in the study of men. The book contains the following chapter-heads: The Training of a Pulpit Speaker; The Preacher and His Public; The Sermon and the Public; The Secular Interests of the Clergy; The Preacher and the Social Order; The Character of a Preacher. FRITZ.

Pulpit Mirrors. By *Edwin H. Byington.* 203 pages, 5×7½. $2.00, net. (George H. Doran Company, New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book on homiletics is written along very unusual lines. In the first part the author gives the results of a laboratory study of preaching by citing specimen cases that came under his observation, hence the name *Pulpit Mirrors.* In the second part the author shows how maximum pulpit power can be obtained through Psychoanalysis of Congregations, through the Spirit of Adventure, through Authority, through Preparation, through Workmanship, through Intensity, through Accuracy of Aim, through Delivery. In the third part the author treats of the Technique in Building Sermons: Laying the Foundation, the Sermon's Structural Steel, Door and Dome, Forms and Figures, and Finishing-touches. — The style is simple and fascinating, the presentation is clear and illuminating, the suggestions are practical and good. The author has given us a book so uniquely constructed and so uniquely written that it will arouse new interest in good preaching. A minister ought occasionally to read a good book on homiletics, and here is one that we can recommend. We dare say that a minister who will read this book will find that it will increase that which he should continually strive after: his pulpit efficiency; it being taken for granted, of course, that all his sermonizing be done on the basis of good, sound, orthodox, Biblical exegesis. FRITZ.

As to Being Worldly. By *E. J. Tuuk.* $1.50. (The Eerdmans Publishing Company.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Here is a serious discussion of a very important topic; for the author, a pastor in the Christian Reformed Church, has had the courage of taking up the amusement question, together with the whole field of worldliness at the present time. The book is written from the standpoint of the author's denomination, but is full of information and suggestions for all those who are in charge of young people's work. The presentation is clear and the argumentation cogent, and one will be inclined to agree with the author on almost every point. The scope of the book is indicated by some of the chapter headings, as, for instance: "The Call to Separation"; "Worldliness"; "The Christian at Play"; "A Time to Dance"; "The Rush to the Theater"; "Causing the Brother to Stumble." The entire discussion will serve to encourage those who are trying to stem the increasing tide of worldliness. K.